

REMARKS

Claims 4, 6 and 14 are pending in this application. Claim 4, 6, and 14 have been amended. Claims 1-3, 7-13, and 15-18 were previously canceled. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the original claims and other claims in this and other applications. In view of the amendments to the claims and the remarks below, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.

Claims 4, 6, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2003/0046682 to Crespo et al. ("Crespo") in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0083131 to Machida ("Machida"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 4 relates to a technique that reduces a parameter inputting load during installation of software. According to claim 4 "a template of a scenario" and an "installation program" are saved in a computer to which a plurality of items of software is being installed. Installation is preformed so that "print setting information" appropriate to the computer is searched and retrieved from "an installation database," and "a scenario" appropriate for the computer is applied to the "installation program." The computer on which the installation is being performed searches the installation database "based on information stored in said computer." The scenario integrates print setting information into parameters of a template for installation. The claim 4 method reduces the parameters that must be input during software installation.

Crespo, on the other hand, discloses that the SD server executes "a SRC file" and "a SDCONF process." Crespo at [0107]. The Crespo reference does not teach or suggest a computer, to which software is being installed, creating a scenario. According to the teaching of Crespo, a user must manually input information such as the "name of machine", the "name of SD server", etc., when installing software. Crespo therefore does not teach or suggest producing a scenario ("a file describing procedures for installing the software") according to the claim 4 method.

Machida does not cure the deficiencies of Crespo with regard to claim 4. Machida describes a system that updates properties of an already installed program. As indicated in the

Allowable Subject Matter section of the Office Action dated December 9, 2008, Machida does not describe a computer to which software is being installed creating a scenario. Machida does describe a search for information, but Machida's search retrieves property information for an already installed driver. Machida at [0009]; Figure 7. The information is not information used to create a scenario for an installation. It would not make sense for Machida to search for the information required by Crespo ("name of machine", etc.) because the information would be on the local machine.

Crespo can not be combined with Machida to teach a method that includes a computer searching for information to produce a scenario to be installed on the computer. In Crespo, the computers receiving an installation are not operable prior to configuration of the installation files. Crespo states that the "present invention is described for use in pristine installation on servers or workstations." Crespo at [0054]. Even though Crespo goes on to state that "this description is illustrative rather than limiting" and "those skilled in the art may extend its use to other environments," this does not mean that the reference actually teaches use of a reversed implementation where end computers collect information and prepare installation packages for installation on themselves. This statement may suggest "other environments" such as those with mobile devices or other devices, but does not teach or suggest the claimed configuration, wherein each computer searches for information to be used in building its own installation package.

Centralization is a central goal of Crespo. Crespo states that a goal is to build a machine profiling mechanism "controlled by a central repository." Crespo at [0014]. Even if this does not teach away, as argued by the Office Action, there is nothing in Crespo that does teach or suggest a system where each individual computer searches for information to build their own installations. The suggested combination would require entirely reconfiguring Crespo to operate in an opposite fashion than that which is described. There would be no apparent reason to do this, as it would eliminate the benefits that are the goals of the Crespo system. There is no support in the references for any reason that Crespo would be reconfigured in this manner. Every embodiment of Crespo includes installation files configured entirely by a central server and then sent to computers merely for installation.

Machida does not provide any apparent reason for modifying the Crespo system to include a computer that itself searches for information to produce a scenario for installation of software on the computer. Machida does not distribute this task to each computer. Machida describes, as an object of the invention, “to provide a technique of push-installing a driver and setting property information of that driver in accordance with a setup command issued by a server device.” Machida at [0012]. Machida’s computer only searches for settings after an installation is complete. Machida at [0009].

Machida and Crespo both only describe push installation methods, and there is no reason provided by either reference to reconfigure Crespo to have a computer search for information used to produce scenarios for the installation of files onto itself. Though it may be “old and well known to perform computer activities either on a server or a computer depending on specific needs,” as described by the Office Action at page 4, the two configurations are not interchangeable. As suggested by the Office Action, specific needs indicate the configuration, and Crespo is explicitly configured to take advantage of a centralized distribution. The references provide no apparent reason for using Crespo’s system in the opposite fashion.

The Office Action, at page 3, suggests a combination with Machida where “it is actually Machida’s computer, using Crespo’s method of PC related information acquisition, which would perform the search in the combination of Crespo and Machida.” In Crespo, however, the information acquisition is via manual input of the name of the machine, the SD server, etc. Crespo at [0084]. This combination would not function according to the claim 4 method, which searches for information used to produce a scenario on a computer that will receive an installation. Neither reference remotely suggests the building of installation packages based on information collected by the computers receiving installations. Machida does not provide any apparent reason to place Crespo’s template building and installation on a local computer, especially because Machida itself describes receiving installation files “pushed” from a server. See Machida at [0012]. The search performed by Machida is only performed after installation.

Machida and Crespo do not teach “producing a scenario” as described in claim 4. The proposed combination would still require manual entry of computer information, as neither reference teaches a computer that search for information that can be used during a subsequent installation. Both references describe a “push” installation by a server, and so they do not teach or suggest the claim 4 system, where software is installed on a computer when the computer itself searches for parameters to be used to produce a scenario for installation. Neither reference provides any reason for Crespo’s purposely centralized installation system to be distributed to every computer individually, as proposed by the Office Action. In fact, Machida and Crespo use the same centralized “push” style system for their installation. The integration of software installation and software setup on a computer is not remotely suggested in either reference. Using a computer to search for print setting information and produce a scenario that integrates an installation template with the retrieved information (thus “installing a plurality of items of software . . . and simultaneously performing an initial print setup”) is one of the important novel features of claim 4, and is not suggested by the references, alone or in combination.

Claim 4 is allowable for at least these reasons. Claims 6 and 14 include similar limitations and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 14 is allowable for additional reasons as well. Claim 14 recites “a computer” with elements configured to “acquire the template of a scenario [and] read the template,” “a processor configured to produce the scenario,” an element “configured to input the produced scenario to an installation program,” and “an installing element configured to install said installation program.” Machida and Crespo, even if combined, do not teach or suggest a computer with elements configured to perform each of the features of claim 14. Even if the references could be combined in the manner indicated by the Office Action, they do not teach or suggest “a computer” that would perform all of these functions.

In view of the above, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance. If there are any additional charges in connection with this filing or any subsequent filings (including but not limited to issue fees), the Examiner is respectfully requested and authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 04-1073 therefor under Order No. R2184.0239/P239.

Dated: February 17, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Mark J. Thronson

Registration No.: 33,082

Jonathan L. Falkler

Registration No.: 62,115

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP

1825 Eye Street, NW

Washington, DC 20006-5403

(202) 420-2200

Attorneys for Applicant